



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/039,789	03/16/1998	EDWARD LAWRENCE CARVER JR.	4537-01-2	9998

7590 02/15/2002

ATTN: ANITA LOMARTRA  
700 STATE STREET, GRANITE SQUARE  
P.O. BOX 1960  
NEW HAVEN, CT 065091960

EXAMINER

SODERQUIST, ARLEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 02/15/2002

29

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T.D-29

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/039,789

Applicant(s)  
Carver Jr. et al.

Examiner  
Arlen Soderquist

Group Art Unit  
1743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arlen Soderquist

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mark D. Girratana

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 14, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all in general

Identification of prior art discussed:  
the applied art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant urged that the art of record failed to provide motivation for modifying the primary references to change the volumes of lysing agent added. discussed the showing that different animal bloods are known to react differently with lysing agents. in particular the Halliday reference was pointed to by examiner since there is a clear showing that a concentration effect was able to change the response of the counting apparatus. in looking at the Halliday reference examiner pointed out that there are two different things listed: the particle counter and a diluter. discussed the possibility that this means there were two separate devices and the diluter was modified to perform the modified lysing agent mixing method. Will consider applicant's response when filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

*Arlen Soderquist*

ARLEN SODERQUIST  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.